

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is built upon a common desire to promote democratic ideals throughout the world. But as we strive to encourage democracy in developing nations, something is sorely amiss in our China policy.

When the CEOs of multinational corporations lobby for increased trade with China, they talk about access to 1.2 billion Chinese consumers. What they do not say is that their real interest is 1.2 billion Chinese workers, workers whom they pay 10 cents, 20 cents, 30 cents, 40 cents an hour.

These CEOs will tell us that increasing trade with China will force China to improve, that engagement with China will bring democracy to that Communist dictatorship. But as we engage with developing countries in trade and investment, democratic counties in the developing world are losing ground to more authoritarian countries. Democratic nations such as India are losing out to more totalitarian governments such as China where the people are not free and the workers do as they are told.

In the post-Cold War decade, the share of developing country exports to the U.S. for democratic nations fell from 53 percent in 1989 to 34 percent in 1998. Corporate America wants to do business with countries with docile work forces that earn below poverty wages and are not allowed to organize to bargain collectively.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell 21 percent, from 56 percent to 35 percent. Corporations are relocating their manufacturing to more authoritarian regimes where the workers do not talk back for fear of being punished.

Western corporations want to invest in countries that have below poverty wages, that have nonexistent environmental standards, that have no worker safety standards, that have no opportunities to bargain collectively. As developing nations make progress toward democracy, as they increase worker rights, as they create regulation to protect the environment, American business punishes them by pulling its trade and pulling its investment in favor of other totalitarian governments.

Decisions about the Chinese economy are made by three groups: the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, which controls a significant number of the business that export to the United States, and, third, Western investors. Do any of these three want to empower workers? Does the Chinese Communist Party want the Chinese people to enjoy human rights? No. Does the People's Liberation Army want to close the labor camps? I do not think so. Do Western investors want Chinese workers to bargain collectively? Obviously no. None of these groups, I repeat, none of these groups, the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, and Western investors,

none of these groups have any interest in changing the current situation in China. All three profit too much from the status quo to want to see human rights and labor rights improve in China.

The People's Republic of China ignores the United Nations High Commission on Human Rights. The People's Republic of China ignores the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. They ignore the State Department's country reports, and the People's Republic of China has broken almost every agreement they have made with the United States. Why would the Chinese government pay any attention to the congressional task force? Passing PNTR, passing permanent Most Favored Nation status trading privileges for China, will only confirm that China's behavior will continue and worsen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WOMEN'S ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier on equal pay day, May 11, which is today, which indicates that women have had to work 4½ months longer than men to achieve equal pay. I wanted to comment a little further on that with some statistics, and then I want to go into an invitation to women as well as men to join all of us on Sunday, Mother's Day at the Million Mom March for common-sense gun legislation.

But, first of all, let me mention, women have made great strides in education and in the work force. When one looks at the statistics, the majority of undergraduate and master's degrees are awarded to women. Forty percent of all doctorates are earned by women. More than 7.7 million businesses in the United States are owned and operated by women. These businesses employ 15.5 million people, which is about 35 percent more than the Fortune 500 companies worldwide.

Women are running for elected office in record numbers. When I was first elected to the House in 1987, there were 26 women in the House and two in the Senate. In 2000, we now have 58 women serving in the House and nine in the Senate. It sounds like quite an addition. Not enough. Not enough, but certainly we can see there has been an increase.

While many doors to employment and educational opportunity have opened for women, they still get paid less than men for the same work.

Women who work full time earn less than men employed for the full time. The average college graduate woman earns a little more than the average male high school graduate. Full-time working women earn only about 73 cents for every dollar that a man earns.

That number, as I mentioned before, African American women earn only 63 cents for every dollar. Hispanic women earn only 53 cents for every dollar. We need to remember the struggle for equality is not over. Although women are and continue to be the majority of new entrants into the workplace, they continue to be clustered in low-skilled, low-paying jobs. Part-time and temporary workers, the majority of whom are women, are among the most vulnerable of all workers. They receive lower pay, fewer or no benefits, and little, if any, job security.

Women account for more than 45 percent of the work force and, yet, they are underrepresented and face barriers in the fields of science, engineering, and technology, especially.

Recently, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the most prestigious science and engineering university in the country issued a report revealing that female professors at the school suffer from pervasive discrimination.

For all of those reasons, that is why I introduced the Commission on the Advancement of Women in Science, Engineering and Technology Development Act. That was passed in the previous 105th Congress and signed into law. This Commission has met many times during this past year, and we will release their report in June of this year.

The Commission's report will help us find out what is keeping women and minorities and persons with disabilities out of technological fields at this critical time. In addition, we will have ascertained what are effective and productive policies that can address the underrepresentation of women in the sciences and could help alleviate the increasing shortage of information technology workers and engineers.

I see this as the first step in encountering the roadblocks to women in our rapidly evolving high-tech society, and it is going to help women finally help to breakthrough that glass ceiling and the silicone ceiling in the fields of science, engineering and technology.

Let me also point out that, as women retire, we are understanding the economic problems of the elderly. Women are affected in disproportionate numbers because we tend to have lower pension benefits than men. Pension policies have not accommodated women in their traditional role as family care givers.

□ 1630

Women move in and out of the work force more frequently when family needs arise, making it more difficult for them to accrue retirement credits.

Consequently, Social Security is especially important for women. Women are heavily reliant on Social Security, and since its inception, Social Security has often been the only income source keeping women from living out their days in poverty.

As elderly women continue to outlive their male counterparts and as medical care costs for the elderly continue to rise, fundamental reform to the Social Security System will have important implications for today's female Baby Boomers and Generation Xers and for women of future generations. It is generally daughters who bear much of the responsibility for their aging parents. In this way, women of all generations will be deeply impacted if the current system is not fundamentally reformed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge May 11 as Equal Pay Day to mark the wage disparity between genders.

Women have made great strides in education and in the work force. The majority of undergraduate and master's degrees are awarded to women, and 40 percent of all doctorates are earned by women. More than 7.7 million businesses in the United States are owned and operated by women. These businesses employ 15.5 million people, about 35 percent more than the Fortune 500 companies worldwide. And women are running for elected offices in record numbers. When I first came to the House in 1987, three were 26 women in the House and two in the Senate. In 2000, there are 58 women serving in the House, and 9 in the Senate.

While many doors to employment and educational opportunity have opened for women, they still get paid less than men for the same work. Women who work full-time earn less than men who are employed full-time. The average woman college graduate earns little more than the average male high school graduate. Full-time working women earn only about 73 cents for each dollar a man earns. That number for African-American women is 63 cents to every dollar and 53 cents for Hispanic women. We need to remember that the struggle for equity is not over.

Although women are and continue to be the majority of new entrants into the workplace, they continue to be clustered in low-skilled, low-paying jobs. Part-time and temporary workers, the majority of whom are women, are among the most vulnerable of all workers. They receive lower pay, fewer or no benefits, and little if any job security.

Women account for more than 45 percent of the work force, yet they are under-represented and face barriers in the fields of science, engineering, and technology. Recently, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the most prestigious science and engineering university in the country, issued a report revealing that female professors at the school suffer from pervasive discrimination. That is why I introduced the Commission on the Advancement of Women in Science, Engineering and Technology Development Act. My legislation passed in the 105th Congress and was signed into law.

This commission has met several times in the past year and will release their report in June. The commission's report will help us find out what is keeping women out of technological fields at this critical time. In addition,

we will have ascertained what are effective and productive policies that can address the under-representation of women in the sciences and could help alleviate the increasing shortage of information technology workers and engineers. This legislation is a first step in countering the roadblocks for women in our rapidly evolving high-tech society, and will help women break through the "Glass Ceiling" and the "Silicon Ceiling" in the fields of science, engineering, and technology.

As women retire, we are understanding the economic problems of the elderly. Women are affected in disproportionate numbers because we tend to have lower pensions benefits than men. Pension policies have not accommodated women in their traditional role as family care givers. Women move in and out of the work force more frequently when family needs arise making it more difficult for them to accrue pension credit.

Consequently, Social Security is especially important for women. Women are heavily reliant on Social Security, and since its inception, Social Security has often been the only income source keeping women from living out their days in poverty.

As elderly women continue to outlive their male counterparts and as medical care costs for the elderly continue to rise, fundamental reform to the Social Security system will have important implications for today's female Baby Boomers and Generation Xers, and for women of future generations. It is generally daughters who bear much of the responsibility for their aging parents. In this way, women of all generations will be deeply impacted if the current system is not fundamentally reformed.

For this reason we have passed the Long Term Care Security Act. Women are the most likely care-givers when older relatives or spouses become frail or ill and need care. As more women are employed full time, it becomes more difficult for them to fill the requirements of caring for aging parents and relatives. A recent survey found that 41 percent of women who have been in care-giver roles were forced to quit their jobs or take a leave of absence, and 50 percent had to cut back their working hours to assist loved ones needing care.

Gender Equity is an ongoing struggle that seeps into many facets of all of our lives. We've made a lot of progress, and I hope that we'll work together with our partners to see the end of Equal Pay Day, because the goal will have been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I also, for Mother's Day, invite all of the mothers, and those who care for common sense gun legislation, to meet on Sunday at the Mall to march together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MATTERS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to briefly discuss two unrelated but very important matters of national importance.

Last year, we spent billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars bombing Kosovo. As the Scripps-Howard Newspapers said a few weeks ago, "the outcome certainly has not been a happy one." As the Scripps-Howard chain noted, "many innocent civilians killed."

How cavalierly we brush over that, "many innocent civilians killed." Hundreds of innocent civilians killed and we are not ashamed of that for some reason. Hundreds of thousands made homeless by our actions. We wasted billions of hard-earned tax dollars to make a situation many times worse than it would have been if we had simply stayed out. We bombed people who would like to have been our friends, and we bombed in a situation, and bombed repeatedly, where there was no threat whatsoever to our national security and no vital U.S. interest at stake.

To make things even worse, Newsweek Magazine this week has a major story entitled *The Kosovo Coverup*. Listen to what part of this article says. "An antiseptic war, fought by pilots flying safely three miles high. It seems almost too good to be true, and it was. In fact, as some critics suspected at the time, the air campaign against the Serb military in Kosovo was largely ineffective. NATO bombs plowed up some fields, blew up hundreds of cars, trucks, and decoys, and barely dented Serb artillery and armor. According to a suppressed Air Force report obtained by Newsweek, the number of targets verifiably destroyed was a tiny fraction of those claimed: 14 tanks, not 120, as claimed; 18 armored personnel carriers, not 220; 20 artillery pieces, not 450. Out of the 744 'confirmed strikes' by NATO pilots during the war, the Air Force investigators who spent weeks combing Kosovo by helicopter and by foot found evidence of just 58."

About 5 years ago, I remember reading on the front page of The Washington Post one day that we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. A couple of years ago, I remember another Member on this floor saying we had our troops in Bosnia giving rabies shots to dogs. Well, I have nothing whatsoever against the Haitians, but they should pick up their own garbage. And I have nothing whatsoever against the Bosnians, but they should give their own rabies shots.

We should stop sending our troops into situations where there is no vital U.S. interest at stake and no threats to national security and turning our military into international social workers and spending billions and billions of hard-earned tax dollars in the process.

This administration has committed troops to other countries 36 times more than the six previous administrations